L. B. (I) No. 68 Vol. VI

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

(SEVENTH LOK SABHA)

SIXTH REPORT

(*Presented on* 17 *November*, 1983)

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

November, 1983/*Agrahayana*, 1905 (*Saka*)

Price : *Rs.* 2.60

CONTENTS

		PAGE
1.	Personnel of the Committee of Privileges .	(iii)
2.	Report	1
3.	Minutes of sittings of Committee	11
4.	Minutes of evidence	27
5.	Appendices	51

PERSONNEL OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES*
(1983-84)

Shri R. R. Bhole—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri H. K. L. Bhagat
3. Shri Buta Singh
4. Shri Chandulal Chandrakar
5. Shri Somnath Chatterjee
6. Shri George Fernandes
7. Shri Indrajit Gupta
8. Shri Ram Jethmalani
9. Shri Jaipal Singh Kashyap
10. Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal
11. Shri Y. S. Mahajan
12. Shri K. Ramamurthy
13. Shri Ramayan Rai
14. Shri P. Shiv Shankar
15. Shri Zainul Basher

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. P. Gupta—*Chief Examiner of Bills and Resolutions*

Shri T. S. Ahluwalia—*Senior Table Officer*

---

*The Committee of Privileges was nominated by the Speaker on 1 June, 1983.

SIXTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

(SEVENTH LOK SABHA)

I. Introduction and Procedure

I, the Chairman of the Committee of Privileges, having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this their Sixth Report to the House on the question of privilege raised by Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., against the Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University for his alleged undignified and unbecoming behaviour with him at a meeting of the Court of Aligarh Muslim University held on 26 March, 1983, and referred[1] to the Committee by the House on 29 April, 1983, with instructions to report by the first week of the next session (Twelfth Session).

2. The Committee held seven sittings. The relevant minutes of these sittings form part of the Report and are appended hereto.

3. At their first sitting held on 5 May, 1983, the Committee decided that, in the first instance, Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P. be requested to appear before the Committee for oral examination. He was, accordingly, requested to appear before the Committee on 30 May, 1983.

4. At their second sitting held on 30 May, 1983, the Committee decided to postpone the oral examination of Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad to their next sitting, as requested by him.

5. At their third sitting held on 28 June, 1983, the Committee examined on oath, Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P.

The Committee also decided that the Ministry of Education and Culture (Department of Education) might be asked to obtain an authenticated copy of verbatim proceedings or any other record of the meeting of the Court of Aligarh Muslim University held on 26 March, 1983.

6. At their fourth sitting held on 8 July, 1983, the Committee decided to seek[2] extension of time from the House for presentation of their Report upto the last day of the first week of Thirteenth Session of Lok Sabha.

---

[1] L. S. Deb., dt. 29-4-1983, cc. 269—73.

[2] The motion was adopted by the House on 28 July, 1983.

7. At their fifth sitting held on 3 August, 1983, the Committee considered the matter further and decided that the Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University, be asked through the Ministry of Education and Culture (Department of Education) to appear before the Committee in person for oral examination.

8. At their sixth sitting held on 25 August, 1983, the Committee examined on oath Shri Saiyid Hamid, Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University.

The Committee also deliberated on the matter and arrived at their conclusions.

9. At their seventh sitting held on 4 October, 1983, the Committee considered their draft Report and adopted it.

II. Facts of the Case

10. On 4 April, 1983, Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., gave notice[3] of a question of privilege against the Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University for his alleged undignified and unbecoming behaviour with him at a meeting of the Court of Aligarh Muslim University held on 26 March, 1983.

Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., had *inter alia* stated in his notice[4] as follows :—

> "That in the course of meeting I sought permission of the Chair (Vice-Chancellor) to express my views. However, as soon as I addressed the Chairman and had not completed even the first sentence, the Vice-Chancellor interrupted me and in an extremely harsh tone asked me to lower my voice. He further said that whenever I speak he feels that his head is being hammered. I pointed out to him that my hearing capabilities are not normal. I pointed to the hearing aid I use, and also explained that it is normal that such persons speak with raised voices and even in Parliament I speak like this. On this the Vice-Chancellor told me contemptuously that this is not Parliament House and he is not hard of hearing. He further said that he will interrupt me again and again.

---

3 *See* Appendix I.

4 *Ibid.*

This is not first time that the Vice-Chancellor behaved in this manner. Even in an earlier meeting his behaviour with me and other members was less than dignified.

Because of the above mentioned behaviour of the Vice-Chancellor, I am finding it difficult to discharge my duties as a representative of this hon'ble House on the Court of Aligarh Muslim University.

I feel that by acting in this unbecoming manner the Vice-Chancellor has committed breach of privilege and contempt of the House."

11. Under the direction of the Speaker, a copy of the notice of question of privilege given by Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., was forwarded to the Ministry of Education and Culture (Department of Education) for furnishing the factual comments on the matter. The Ministry of Education and Culture (Department of Education) furnished a factual note containing parawise comments[5] received by them from the Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University. The Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University *inter alia* stated as under :—

"Mr. Mohd. Asrar Ahmad participated at the meetings of the University Court held on December 20, 1982 and March 26, 1983. Even at the first meeting Mr. Mohd. Asrar Ahmad spoke very loudly while speaking. This impeded the smooth functioning of the Court and adversely affected the deliberations and their even tenor. After this meeting was over I took Mr. Asrar Ahmad aside and requested him that it would be desirable if in future his intervention could be in a less loud tone. He stated that he speaks at the top of his voice because he is hard of hearing.

At the second meeting of the Court, Mr. Asrar Ahmad tried to monopolise the discussion and every few minutes he used to get up, gesticulate and talk at the top of his voice. Being charged with the responsibility of conducting the proceedings I had to request him to desist from frequent intervention and to speak less loudly .... I requested him to speak less loudly for when he speaks at the top of his voice it falls like hammer on the ears of the audience.

---

5 *See* Appendix II.

It is entirely baseless to say that I made a reference to Parliament. This allegation has evidently been invented by Mr. Asrar Ahmad to support the privilege motion. There was no occasion for me to make a reference to Parliament and it would have been highly indecorous and in bad taste to make any such reference.

.....I have the highest regard for Parliament and its Members and I have neither committed nor did I intend to commit a breach of privilege of any honourable M.P."

12. As directed by the Speaker, a copy of the factual comments received from the Ministry of Education and Culture, was given to Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P.

13. Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad in his further letter[6] dated 28 April, 1983, addressed to the Speaker, *inter alia,* stated as follows :—

".....If the Vice-Chancellor chooses to call it an effort on my part to monopolise the discussion he is free to do so. Indeed, at least in his letter he is using slightly mild language contrary to his extremely harsh outbursts in the meeting of the Court. Still I feel that even in his comments in response to the privilege notice the language and tone which he has used are not in the best traditions of Parliamentary procedure but smack of arrogance and scant respect for the Parliament

He has tried to add insult to the injury by saying that in the meeting of the Court he made no reference to the Parliament and alleging that this has been invented by me..... I am surprised that instead of feeling sorry for all the derogatory statements which he made and withdrawing them in a gentlemanly manner he has chosen to own part of it and disown the rest.

.....he was well within his rights not to have allowed me to speak 'on the ground that it impeded the smooth functioning of the Court and adversely affected the deliberations and their even tenor'. But he did not do so. It appears that he chose the other way *i.e.* to interrupt me and insult me by saying that 'my voice falls like a hammer on the ears of the audience'.

---

[6] *See* Appendix III.

I strongly feel that not only his conduct during the meeting of the Court but even his comments in response to the privilege notice amount to contempt and breach of privilege."

14. On 29 April, 1983, Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad raised the question of privilege in the House with the consent of the Speaker and moved the following motion[7], which was adopted by the House :—

"That the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges with instructions to report by the first week of the next session."

III. Findings of the Committee

15. Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., during the course of his evidence[8] stated *inter alia* as follows :—

"I was asked there to speak slowly. 'Don't speak so loudly. When you speak, it appears that someone is hammering on our ears'. Then I said 'I am hard of hearing, I speak loudly. I speak loudly in Parliament also'. He said that it was not Parliament."

Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., added that on being pointed out by him that before him other persons had also spoken loudly, then why he was interrupting him only? The Vice-Chancellor told him "you would be interrupted again and again". To a question : "You went to University Court on behalf of Lok Sabha and when you were participating in the meeting how can you say that you were obstructed by V.C. from discharging the duties for the fulfilment of which you had gone there ?" Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad replied : "So far as the question of obstruction is concerned neither was I allowed to speak nor to discharge my duties".

16. Shri Saiyid Hamid, Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University, in his evidence[9] before the Committee deposed that "the allegations made against me are unfounded. I have the highest respect for Parliament and I have invariably behaved with decorum and respect towards all the members of the Court including the members sent to the Court of the University by Parliament". Shri Saiyid Hamid added that he had a span of 37 years as a civil servant and the Committee could get his entire record of service from the Department of Personnel and they would not come across any incident in which he had behaved indecorously with a member of the Central Legislature or the State Legislature.

[7] L. S. Deb, dt. 29-4-1983, c. 273.

[8] *See* Minutes of evidence.

[9] *See* Minutes of evidence.

In reply to a question : "was there any reference to Parliament on that day ?" Shri Saiyid Hamid stated : "I did not make any reference to Parliament. I did not utter the word 'Parliament' at all". When it was pointed out to Shri Saiyid Hamid that "have you not said this to him that 'your voice falls like a hammer and this is not Parliament'." He stated that "what I said was this. It is an idiom, it is a witticism : translated into English it might seem a little offensive; otherwise it is just a witticism; idiom-based. "आप जोर से बोलते हैं तो सामयिन के कानों पर हथौड़े बनकर गिरता है।" That witticism unfortunately, which should have made him less tense, was misconstrued. He appears to have felt hurt on that basis. It was an unfortunate thing that it was misconstrued. I had absolutely no intention of hurting him or saying that he was doing any damage to the ear-drums of the audience. That was never my intention". When asked : "you said, you would interrupt him again and again", Shri Saiyid Hamid said : "Sir, this is a highly inconceivable thing. This can only be attributed to an urchin in a street brawl who would pull up his sleeves and say I will never allow you to speak. I never adopted a menacing or intimidating sort of attitude". In reply to another question : "was there any incident earlier where hot words or exchange of words had taken place between you and the M.P. ?" Shri Saiyid Hamid stated : "No, I would not dub it as an exchange of hot words when I uttered a witticism which was unfortunately misconstrued.....Never in my long career before taking over the office of Vice-Chancellor, has anybody accused me of being indecorous or rough or short-tempered".

IV. Conclusions

17. After careful consideration of the evidence of Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P. and Shri Saiyid Hamid, Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University, the Committee feel that there had been some misconception about the use of words, "आप जोर से बोलते हैं तो सामयिन के कानों पर हथौड़े बनकर गिरता है।" (when you speak loudly, your voice falls like hammers on the ears of audience), by the Vice-Chancellor while requesting Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad to speak in a lower tone. During the course of his evidence, Shri Saiyid Hamid clarified more than once that he had absolutely no intention of hurting the feelings of Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad or obstructing him from speaking at the meeting of the Court.

18. The Committee feel that as a Presiding Officer of the Court, the Vice-Chancellor had certain duties and powers to conduct and regulate the proceedings of the Court and that Members of the Court including

the Members representing Parliament are expected to extend their cooperation to the Vice-Chancellor. A Member of Parliament would naturally have to discharge his functions in the meetings of the Court like other members, within the parameters of his position as a Member of the Court as distinct from his duties as a Member of Parliament in Parliament.

19. The Committee note that the Vice-Chancellor has categorically denied that he made any reference to Parliament at all, least of all in a contemptuous way.

20. The Committee are of the opinion that taking into account the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, no further notice need be taken of the matter.

V. Recommendations

21. The Committee recommend that no further action be taken by the House in the matter and it may be dropped.

R. R. BHOLE
Chairman,
Committee of Privileges.

NEW DELHI ;
October 4, 1983

Asvina 12, 1905 *(Saka)*

MINUTES

MINUTES

I

First Sitting

New Delhi, Thursday, 5 May, 1983

The Committee sat from 16.00 to 16.30 hours.

PRESENT

Shri R. R. Bhole—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal
3. Shri Y. S. Mahajan
4. Shri P. Shiv Shankar
5. Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. P. Gupta—*Chief Examiner of Bills and Resolutions.*

2. The Committee considered the question of privilege raised by Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., against the Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University for his alleged undignified and unbecoming behaviour with him at a meeting of the Court of Aligarh Muslim University held on 26 March, 1983.

3. The Committee decided that, in the first instance, Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., be asked to appear before the Committee for oral evidence in the last week of May, 1983.

4. ** ** **

The Committee then adjourned.

**Para 4 relates to another case and has accordingly been omitted.

II

Second Sitting

New Delhi, Monday, 30 May, 1983

The Committee sat from 11.00 to 12.15 hours.

PRESENT

Shri R. R. Bhole—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

2. Shri H. K. L. Bhagat
3. Shri George Fernandes
4. Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal
5. Shri Y. S. Mahajan
6. Shri P. Shiv Shankar
7. Shri Krishna Prakash Tewari
8. Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah
9. Shri Vijay Kumar Yadav

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. P. Gupta—*Chief Examiner of Bills and Resolutions.*

2. At the outset, the Chairman informed the Committee that Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., who had been requested to appear before the Committee on 30 May, 1983, for oral examination in connection with the question of privilege raised by him against the Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University for his alleged undignified and unbecoming behaviour with him at a meeting of the Court of Aligarh Muslim University held on 26 March, 1983, had intimated that it would not be possible for him to appear before the Committee on 30 May, 1983, as he would be busy with elections to Panchayats and Zila Parishads in Uttar Pradesh and that the date of his appearance before the Committee might be extended by a week later in June, 1983.

The Committee decided that Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., might be asked to appear before the Committee for oral examination at their next sitting.

3. ** **

4. ** **

5. The Committee decided to hold their next sitting on 28 June, 1983.

The Committee then adjourned.

**Paras 3 and 4 relate to other cases and have accordingly been omitted.

III

Third Sitting

New Delhi, Tuesday, 28 June, 1983

The Committee sat from 11.00 to 11.50 hours and again from 15.30 to 16.30 hours.

PRESENT

Shri R. R. Bhole—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

2. Shri H. K. L. Bhagat
3. Shri Chandulal Chandrakar
4. Shri George Fernandes
5. Shri Jaipal Singh Kashyap
6. Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal
7. Shri K. Ramamurthy
8. Shri Ramayan Rai
9. Shri P. Shiv Shankar
10. Shri Zainul Basher

SECRETARIAT

Shri K. K. Saxena—*Joint Secretary.*

WITNESSES

(1) ** ** **

(2) Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P.

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members of the new Committee,

**Serial No. (1) relates to another case and has accordingly been omitted.

3—7. ** ** **

8. The Committee took up consideration of the question of privilege raised by Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., against the Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University for his alleged undignified and unbecoming behaviour with him at a meeting of the Court of Aligarh Muslim University held on 26 March, 1983.

9. Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., was called in and examined on oath by the Committee.

(Verbatim record of evidence was kept)

The witness then withdrew.

10. The Committee decided that the Ministry of Education and Culture (Department of Education) might be asked to obtain an authenticated copy of verbatim proceedings or any other record of the sitting of the Court of Aligarh Muslim University held on 26 March, 1983.

The Committee then adjourned.

**Paras 3—7 relate to other cases and have accordingly been omitted.

IV

Fourth Sitting

New Delhi, Friday, 8 July, 1983

The Committee sat from 11.00 to 12.00 hours.

PRESENT

Shri R. R. Bhole—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Chandulal Chandrakar
3. Shri Somnath Chatterjee
4. Shri Jaipal Singh Kashyap
5. Shri Y. S. Mahajan
6. Shri K. Ramamurthy

SECRETARIAT

Shri K. K. Saxena—*Joint Secretary.*

2—8. ** ** **

9. The Committee then considered the question of privilege raised by Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., against the Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University for his alleged undignified and unbecoming behaviour with him at a meeting of the Court of Aligarh Muslim University held on 26 March, 1983. The Chairman informed the Committee that in addition to the minutes of the Aligarh Muslim University Court dated 26/27 March, 1983, the Vice-Chancellor had also forwarded copies of his letters addressed to the members of the Court and their replies to him stating that the Vice-Chancellor had never mentioned about Parliament during the above meetings of Aligarh Muslim University Court. The Committee directed that copies of letters of Vice-Chancellor addressed by him to the members of the Court and their replies be circulated to the members of the Committee.

The Committee also decided to seek extension of time for presenting their report on the matter to the House upto the last day of the first week of the Winter Session.

The Committee then adjourned.

**Paras 2—8 relate to other cases and have accordingly been omitted.

V

Fifth Sitting

New Delhi, Wednesday, 3 August, 1983

The Committee sat from 15.30 to 16.15 hours.

PRESENT

Shri R. R. Bhole—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

2. Shri H. K. L. Bhagat
3. Shri Indrajit Gupta
4. Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal
5. Shri Y. S. Mahajan
6. Shri Ramayan Rai
7. Shri P. Shiv Shankar
8. Shri Zainul Basher

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. P. Gupta—*Chief Examiner of Bills and Resolutions.*

2—3. ** ** **

4. The Committee then considered the question of privilege raised by Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., against the Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University for his alleged undignified and unbecoming behaviour with him at a meeting of the Court of Aligarh Muslim University held on 26 March, 1983. The Committee decided that the Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, might be asked through the Ministry of Education and Culture (Department of Education) to appear before the Committee in person on 25 August, 1983, for oral examination.

5. ** ** **

The Committee then adjourned.

**Paras 2, 3 and 5 relate to other cases and have accordingly been omitted.

VI

Sixth Sitting

New Delhi, Thursday, 25 August, 1983

The Committee sat from 15.30 to 17.45 hours.

PRESENT

Shri R. R. Bhole—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

2. Shri H. K. L. Bhagat
3. Shri Somnath Chatterjee
4. Shri George Fernandes
5. Shri Indrajit Gupta
6. Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal
7. Shri Y. S. Mahajan
8. Shri Ramayan Rai
9. Shri P. Shiv Shankar
10. Shri Zainul Basher

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. P. Gupta—*Chief Examiner of Bills and Resolutions.*

WITNESSES

(1) Shri Saiyid Hamid,
Vice-Chancellor,
Aligarh Muslim University,
Aligarh.

(2) ** ** **

2. The Committee took up consideration of the question of privilege raised by Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., against the Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University, for his alleged undignified and unbecoming behaviour with him at a meeting of the Court of Aligarh Muslim University held on 26 March, 1983.

**Serial No. (2) relates to another case and has accordingly been omitted.

3. Shri Saiyid Hamid, Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, was called in and examined on oath by the Committee.

(Verbatim record of evidence was kept)

The witness then withdrew.

4. The Committee then deliberated on the matter. The Committee felt that as a Presiding Officer of the Court, the Vice-Chancellor had certain duties and powers to conduct and regulate the proceedings of the Court and that members of the Court including the Members representing Parliament were expected to extend their cooperation to the Vice-Chancellor. A Member of Parliament would naturally have to discharge his function in the meetings of the Court like other members within the parameters of his position as a member of the Court as distinct from his duties as a Member of Parliament in the Parliament.

The Committee were of the opinion that taking into account the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, no further notice need be taken of the matter.

The Committee decided to recommend to the House that no further action be taken in the matter and it might be dropped.

The Committee directed that Draft Report on the matter might be prepared and circulated to the members of the Committee for consideration at their next sitting.

5-6. ** ** **

The Committee then adjourned.

---

*Paras 5-6 relate to another case and have accordingly been omitted.

VII

Seventh Sitting

New Delhi, Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

The Committee sat from 11.00 to 11.35 hours.

PRESENT

Shri R. R. Bhole—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Chandulal Chandrakar
3. Shri George Fernandes
4. Shri Indrajit Gupta
5. Shri Jaipal Singh Kashyap
6. Shri Ramayan Rai
7. Shri P. Shiv Shankar

SECRETARIAT

(1) Shri M. P. Gupta—*Chief Examiner of Bills and Resolutions.*

(2) Shri T. S. Ahluwalia—*Senior Table Officer.*

2. The Committee considered their draft Sixth Report on the question of privilege raised by Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., against the Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University, for his alleged undignified and unbecoming behaviour with him at a meeting of the Court of Aligarh Muslim University held on 26 March, 1983.

3. The Committee adopted the draft Report with the following modification :—

Paragraph 15—

The following sub-paragraphs be omitted :—

"It was pointed out to Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad that 'the meeting of the Court is presided over by V.C. As a President, he

has the power to allow a person to speak or to disallow him. It is his duty. How do you consider that he had obstructed you in discharge of your duty'. Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad stated : 'whenever I raised a question on the wrong work that was being done, I was not allowed to speak. This means that they deliberately wanted a unilateral action and wanted to obstruct me in my duty.

To a specific question : 'what were the difficulties you were facing in discharging your duties as a member', Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad replied : 'whatever point of order I raised I was asked by him to sit down'."

4. The Committee decided that the evidence taken before the Committee be appended to the Report of the Committee.

5. The Committee authorised the Chairman to present their Sixth Report to the House.

6. ** ** **

7. The Committee decided to hold a meeting on Wednesday, 9 November, 1983, to consider the cases pending before the Committee.

The Committee then adjourned.

**Para 6 relates to another case and has accordingly been omitted.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

LIST OF WITNESSES

Tuesday, 28 *June*, 1983

	PAGE
Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P.	27

Thursday, 25 *August*, 1983

Shri Saiyid Hamid, Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh .	39

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE TAKEN BEFORE THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Tuesday, 28 *June*, 1983

PRESENT

Shri R. R. Bhole—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri H. K. L. Bhagat
3. Shri Chandulal Chandrakar
4. Shri George Fernandes
5. Shri Jaipal Singh Kashyap
6. Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal
7. Shri K. Ramamurthy
8. Shri Ramayan Rai
9. Shri P. Shiv Shankar
10. Shri Zainul Basher

SECRETARIAT

Shri K. K. Saxena—*Joint Secretary*

WITNESS

Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P.

(*The Committee met at* 11.00 *hours*)

Evidence of Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmed, you have been requested to appear before this Committee to give your evidence in connection with the question of privilege raised by you against the Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University for his alleged undignified and unbecoming behaviour with you at a meeting of the Court of Aligarh Muslim University held on 26th March, 1983.

I hope that you will state the facts frankly and truthfully to enable this Committee to arrive at a correct finding.

I may inform you that under Rule 275 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, the evidence that you may give before the Committee and its proceedings will be confidential till the report of the Committee and its proceedings are presented to Lok Sabha. Any premature disclosure or publication of the proceedings of the Committee would constitute a breach of privilege and contempt of the House. The evidence which you will give before the Committee may be reported to the House.

Now you may please take oath or affirmation as you like.

(The witness then took the oath)

सभापति महोदय : आप अपनी बात शुरू कीजिए । इस बारे में आपको क्या कहना है ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : सबसे पहले मैंने 4 अप्रैल, 1983 को जो पत्र लिखा है, इसको पढ़ दूं ?

सभापति महोदय : इस पत्र को कार्यवाही में मान लिया जाएगा ।

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : वहां पर जो मेरे साथ व्यवहार किया गया, उसके बारे में मैं बताना चाहता हूं । वहां पर मुझ से कहा गया कि मेहरबानी करके धीरे बोलिए । आप इतने जोर से मत बोलिए । आप बोलते हैं तो लगता है जैसे हमारे कानों पर हथौड़े पड़ रहे हों । उसके बाद मैंने कहा कि मुझे कम सुनाई देता है इस वजह से शायद मैं जोर से बोलता हूं । मैं पार्लियामेंट में भी जोर से बोलता हूं ।

उन्होंने कहा कि यह पार्लियामेंट नहीं है । मैंने कहा कि मुझ से पहले भी लोग जोर से बोलते रहे हैं, मुझको ही क्यों टोका जा रहा है ? चेयरमैन ने कहा कि आपको बार-बार टोका जाएगा ।

मेरी तौहीन करने के पीछे एक वजह और हो सकती है । इसके बारे में मैं समिति को बताना चाहता हूं । इस मीटिंग से पहले दिसम्बर में एक मीटिंग हुई थी । कई कालेजों से चुन कर लोग आए थे । मैं लोक सभा की तरफ से चुन कर गया था । वहां के एम० एल० ए० इमरार अहमद खां मेरे दोस्त हैं । वे शायद वाइस-चांसलर के दोस्त होंगे । मीटिंग के एक दिन पहले मैं एम० एल० ए० के यहां पहुंच गया । क्योंकि 1980 में जब हिन्दू-मुस्लिम झगड़ा हुआ था तो मेरी ड्यूटी वहां पर लगी थी । उस वक्त मैं उनके यहां ठहरा था । इस बार भी मैंने सोचा कि अगर उनके यहां नहीं जाऊंगा तो वे नाराज होंगे । शाम का वक्त था और उस वक्त वाइस-चांसलर

साहब उनके यहां बैठे हुए थे । उनकी बातचीत हो रही थी । उन्होंने तय किया कि कल जो मीटिंग हो रही है, उसमें चुनाव करवा लिए जाएं । भले ही कालेजों के प्रतिनिधि चुनकर नहीं आए हैं । हमारी मेजारिटी है इसलिए चुनाव करवा लेने चाहिएं। मैंने कहा कि यह बड़े अफसोस की बात है । अभी नया अमेंडमेंट आया है और अभी से पार्टीबंदी शुरू हो रही है । मीटिंग में जब यह बात आई तो मैंने इस बात का विरोध किया । कानून के मुताबिक यह चुनाव नहीं हो सकता । मीटिंग में मेरी बात मान ली गई । लेकिन उन लोगों को यह बात बुरी लगी कि इनकी वजह से हम अपनी पार्टी को मजबूत नहीं कर पाएंगे । उसके बाद यह तय हो गया कि जब चुनाव हो जाएंगे तो हम दूसरी नीति तय कर लेंगे । वह मीटिंग मार्च में होनी थी ।

सभापति महोदय : किस चीज के चुनाव थे ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : कालेजों के प्रतिनिधि चुनकर आने रह गए थे । उसके बाद मीटिंग रख दी गई । उस दिन कालेजों के जो प्रतिनिधि चुनकर आए, वे सभी ऐसे लोग थे जो वाइस-चांसलर के रवैये से खुश नहीं थे । उस बार ये नाजायज चुनाव करना चाहते थे । दो दिन तक डिसकशन चला । हमारे पास जो कापी आई थी उसमें बताया गया था कि अभी चुनाव नहीं होगा ?

मीटिंग में चेयरमैन ने कहा कि जब आप बोलते हैं तो ऐसा लगता है कि हमारे कानों पर हथौड़े मार रहे हैं । हम चाहते थे कि किसी तरह से इलेक्शन हो जाए जिससे यूनिवर्सिटी की हालत सुधरे। उन्होंने हर बार मेरी तौहीन की । मैं उनकी हर बात बरदाश्त करता रहा । उस मीटिंग में आरिफ मोहम्मद खां, हाजी साहब और शहाबुद्दीन साहब थे । और भी कई जाने-माने लोग थे । आरिफ मो० खां साहब को भी बेइज्जत करने की कोशिश की गई । मुझे बहुत सदमा पहुंचा । जब भी मैं प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर उठाता, मुझे बैठने के लिए कह दिया जाता । मैंने कहा बात कहने दो बाद में आप रूल आउट कर दो । लेकिन मुझे नहीं कहने दी । मैं बरदाश्त करता रहा ।

सभापति महोदय : मीटिंग की जो प्रोसीडिंग्स हैं वे वरबेटिम रिकार्ड हुई होंगी ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : वहां वरबेटिम रिकार्ड मेंटेन नहीं किया जाता। आप मंगाएंगे भी तो भी नहीं मिलेगा । होता ही नहीं है ।

श्री अंगुल बशर : आपने जो दिया है यह अपनी तरफ से दिया है ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : यादवाश्त से लिख कर दिया है । मेरे ख्याल में वहां रिकार्ड में कुछ नहीं है । उन्होंने स्पीकर साहब को जो रिप्लाई भेजा है उसमें एक बात को एडमिट किया है, हैमर वाली बात को एडमिट किया है ।

एक और इंसीडेंट इससे पहले वाली मीटिंग में हुआ था । वह सीटिंग अरेंजमट के बारे में था । उस में वाइस-चांसलर बीच में थे, प्रोक्टर एक साइड में और प्रो-वाइस-चांसलर दूसरी साइड में बैठे थे और बाकी सब सामने । मैंने कहा कि क्या रशियन टाइप आफ गवर्नमेंट यूनिवर्सिटी में भी होगी । तीन आदमी क्या प्रेजीडियम मेक करेंगे । इस पर उन्होंने कहा कि यहां पर तो ऐसा ही होगा । ये तीन आदमी सैलरीड एम्प्लायीज हैं और मैंने कहा कि क्या ये प्रेजीडियम बन कर बैठेंगे ? मुम्किन है कि उनको मेरी यह बात बुरी लगी हो ।

सभापति महोदय : आपने यूनिवर्सिटी के रिकार्ड में से यह सब चीज ढूंढने का प्रयत्न किया है या नहीं ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : लिखा ही नहीं जाता है । उन्होंने जो प्रोसीडिंग्ज हमें भेजी हैं उनमें यह कुछ नहीं लिखा है, किस ने क्या कहा, यह नहीं लिखा होता है । वह ब्रीफ रिकार्ड होता है । बाकी मैं देख कर बता सकता हूं ।

सभापति महोदय : इतनी बड़ी प्रोसीडिंग्ज होती हैं क्या उनको लिखा नहीं जाता है ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : जो प्रोसीडिंग्ज हमें भेजी हैं उन में यह कुछ नहीं लिखा कि किस ने क्या कहा । बाकी मैं देख कर ही बता सकूंगा।

सभापति महोदय : चुनाव की क्या बात है ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : इलैक्टोरल कालेज के मैम्बर 42 और कोर्ट के मैम्बर चुनते हैं । पहली मीटिंग में वह गलत तरीके से चुनना चाहते थे जिस को मैंने रोका । मैंने कहा कि ड्यूली कांस्टीट्यूटिड कोर्ट जब तक न हो जाए तब तक कोई इलैक्ट नहीं कर सकता है । इसको शायद उन्होंने नापसन्द किया हो । उन्होंने सोचा हो कि कौन आ जाएगा और कौन नहीं आ जाएगा पता नहीं । शायद यह होल बेसिस था ।

सभापति महोदय : चुनाव की बात जिस मीटिंग में हुई क्या यह इंसीडेंट भी उसी मीटिंग का है ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : पहले वाली मीटिंग में चुनाव की बात हुई थी । उन्होंने एक बात मानी है । स्पीकर साहब ने लैटर भेजा था मेरे लैटर के बेसिस पर । जो जवाब उन्होंने दिया है वह 21-4-83 का है । वह और भी ज्यादा दुखदायक है । इस में यह लिखा है :

In reply to the Lok Sabha Secretariat's U.O. Note dated 20-4-1983, the Ministry of Education and Culture on the subject—'Notice of question of privilege by Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., against the Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University for allegedly using harsh language and interrupting him in the meeting of the University Court held on 26-3-1983' has stated :

"Lok Sabha Secretariat may kindly refer to their U.O. Note No. 17/29/83/Priv/L-I, dated 20-4-1983 on the subject mentioned above. The Ministry had earlier sent an interim reply to the Lok Sabha Secretariat *vide* U.O. Note of even number dated 14-4-1983 pending receipt of parawise factual comments from the Vice-Chancellor, A.M.U. This Ministry has now received the parawise comments on the points made in the notice of breach of privilege given by Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., from the Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University which are re-produced below :—

"1. }
2. } No comments.

3 to 6. It may be stated that Mr. Mohd. Asrar Ahmad participated at the meetings of the University Court held on Dec. 20, 1982 and March 26, 1983. Even at the first meeting Mr. Mohd. Asrar Ahmad spoke very loudly while speaking. This impeded the smooth functioning of the Court and adversely affected the deliberations and their even tenor. After this meeting was over, I took Mr. Asrar Ahmad aside and requested him that it would be desirable if in future his intervention could be in a less loud tone. He stated that he speaks at the top of his voice because he is hard of hearing.

At the second meeting of the Court, Mr. Asrar Ahmad tried to monopolise the discussion and every few minutes he used to get up, gesticulate and talk at the top of his voice. Being charged with the responsibility of conducting the proceedings I had to request him to desist from frequent intervention and to speak less loudly. He stated that he spoke loudly because he was hard of hearing. This appeared to be incorrect because at other times when he was not excited, he spoke in a lower tone. I requested him to speak less loudly for when he speaks at the top of his voice it falls like hammer on the ears of the audience.

It is entirely baseless to say that I made a reference to Parliament. This allegation has evidently been invented by Mr. Asrar

Ahmad to support the privilege motion. There was no occasion for me to make a reference to Parliament and it would have been highly indecorous and in bad taste to make any such reference.

The University, it may be stated, has been following a serious schedule of teaching and research over the last twenty months. Standards have vastly improved all round. It has been my endeavour to maintain normalcy in the University and to uphold the traditions of the great institution of which I have the good fortune to be the Vice-Chancellor. I have the highest regard for Parliament and its Members and I have neither committed nor did I intend to commit a breach of privilege of any honourable M.P.

It is requested that the above facts may please be placed before the Speaker, Lok Sabha, for enabling him to decide the admissibility or otherwise of the notice of privilege in question.

This Ministry has no objection if the above facts are communicated to the Hon'ble Member concerned. This issues with the approval of the Deputy Minister for Education and Social Welfare."

My reply was on 20-4-1983—

MR. CHAIRMAN : We have got it. You rely mostly on the basis of the extracts which you have given and which you have read here. That is one basis. Have you to say anything about the reply which the Department has given to the Speaker ?

SHRI MOHAMMAD ASRAR AHMAD : In this respect I have already submitted a letter to the Hon. Speaker dated 28th. May I read it out ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : That is already on record.

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : इसके अलावा मुझे यह कहना है कि इससे पहले जो मीटिंग हुई थी और जब इलैक्शन नहीं हो सका तो उनके एक पेड ऐमप्लाई आफ दी स्टाफ ने यह कहा कि यह चुनाव इसलिये नहीं होने देते कि एम० पी० का वेस्टेड इंटरेस्ट है । इस बात पर सभी लोगों ने उससे माफ़ी मंगवायी । मैं चूंकि अलीगढ़ यूनीवर्सिटी में 12 साल पढ़ा हूं इसलिये मुझे उससे ज्यादा दिलचस्पी है, और उस जमाने में कोई भी इस तरह की बदतमीजी नहीं करता था । पहले भी मैं यूनीवर्सिटी कोर्ट का मैम्बर रह चुका हूं, डा० जाकिर हुसैन के समय में भी था तब वी०सी० कोर्ट के मैम्बर्स के साथ इस तरह से बिहेव नहीं करता था । मुझसे कहा बैठ जाइए, खड़े

क्यों हैं । एक दफ़ा कहा बैठ जाइए, बैठ जाइए । जब मैं बैठ गया तो कहा अब बोलिये । उसके बाद दूसरा आदमी खड़ा हो कर बोलने लगा । मैंने कहा इसको क्यों बोलने दे रहे हो ? तो कहा मैंने इजाजत दे दी है। उनका ऐप्रोच थ्रू आउट मेम्बर आफ़ दी कोर्ट के अगेन्सट रहा है, और खासकर असरार अहमद । जो आर्बिट्रेरी पावर्स वी०सी० को मिली हुई हैं उनको वह अपनी कन्वीनियेंस के मुताबिक इस्तेमाल कर रहे हैं । यह चीज दूर होनी चाहिये ।

अब उन्होंने एक हरकत और की, चुनाव हो चुका है, कोर्ट कांस्टीट्यूट हो गया, लेकिन कोर्ट को फंक्शन करने से रुकवा दिया है । किसी दूसरे आदमी को कह कर कोर्ट केस करा कर हाई कोर्ट से स्टे लिवा लिया है । लिहाज़ा कोर्ट काम नहीं कर रहा है । नतीजा यह है कि जिस तरह से वह चाहें, जो चाहें करें । इस तरह 3 वर्ष हो गये, दो वर्ष और करते रहें । और अगर हम चुनकर नहीं आये तो हम कोर्ट के मैम्बर नहीं रहेंगे । और इस तरह से वह दो साल गुजार देंगे और यूनीवर्सिटी विल गो टु डौग्स ।

सभापति महोदय : इससे ज्यादा और कोई बातें नहीं हुई ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : जो कर सकते थे वह सब कुछ किया । डांटा, डपटा, सभी कुछ किया । और एम० पीज़० भी थे आप उनसे पूछ लें कि मैंने क्या कहा और उन्होंने क्या कहा । तो क्या हम ही बेइज्जत होने के लिये हैं । हम तो लोक सभा के नुमाइन्दे हैं इसलिये हमारी जिम्मेदारी है कि कोई गलत काम न हो । उनका एक पेड ऐम्पलाई कह सकता है कि हमारा वेस्टेड इंटरेस्ट है । हमने कहा वेस्टेड इंटरेस्ट यही हो सकता है कि इसका माइनारिटी कैरेक्टर रहे । हम किसी को ऐडमीशन दिलाने या नौकरी दिलाने की बात तो नहीं कर रहे हैं ।

सभापति महोदय : दिलचस्पी जरूरत से ज्यादा है, और मेरे ख्याल से उनको ज्यादा दिलचस्पी पसन्द नहीं है ।

श्री जयपाल सिंह कश्यप : जिस लहजे, रफ्तार और तेजी से आप बात कर रहे हैं, उससे ज्यादा बात की थी या इसी ढंग से वहां बात की थी ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : इससे ज्यादा तो नहीं हो सकता है ।

श्री जयपाल सिंह कश्यप : और आपकी यह हमेशा बोलने की आदत है ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : जब से कम सुनने में आता है तो मैं ऐसे ही बोलता हूं ।

श्री जैनुल बशर: आप लोक सभा से चुनकर यूनीवर्सिटी कोर्ट में गये हैं, जब मीटिंग में हिस्सा ले रहे थे तो कैसे कह सकते हैं कि जो फरायज़ की अंजामदेही के लिये आप वहां गये हैं उसमें वी० सी० ने रुकावट डाली ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद: जी हां, मैं लोक सभा से चुन कर गया हूं। जहां तक रुकावट का ताल्लुक है वह इस तरह कि मुझे बोलने नहीं दिया और मुझे अपने कर्त्तव्य का पालन नहीं करने दिया। मेरे पौइंट आफ आर्डर को नहीं सुना और जो सुना उन पर कोई रूलिंग नहीं दी और इस तरह रेकार्ड में नहीं आने दी कोई चीज़ जिससे मैं कह सकता कि यह यह चीज़ हुई। मेरी और मेम्बरान के मुकाबले ज्यादा जिम्मेदारी थी यह देखने की कि ऐक्ट जो नया बना है उसके मुताबिक काम होता है कि नहीं। यह हम देखना चाहते थे।

श्री जैनुल बशर: कोर्ट की मीटिंग को वी० सी० प्रेसाइड करता है। तो ऐज़ प्रेसीडेंट उसको अख्तियार है कि किसको बोलने दे और किस को न बोलने दे। यह उनका एक फर्ज बनता है। उसमें आप कैसे समझते हैं कि उसने आपकी फर्ज-अदायगी में रुकावट डाली ?

श्री महोम्मद असरार अहमद: क्योंकि जो गलत काम हो रहा था उस पर मैं सवाल करता था तो मुझे इजाजत नहीं देते थे। इसके माने हैं कि जानबूझ कर एक तरफा कार्यवाही करना चाहते थे और इस तरह मेरे काम में रुकावट डालना चाहते थे।

श्री जैनुल बशर: पार्लियामेंट की तरफ से चुन कर जाने वाले और भी कुछ एम० पीज़० हैं ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद: जी हां, और लोग भी हैं, जैसे डा० ए०यू० आजमी, काज़ी जलील अब्बासी, समीउद्दीन साहब, राज्य सभा से मौलाना असद मदनी, मौलाना हाशमी, शहाबुद्दीन साहब, तैयब हुसैन आदि।

श्री जैनुल बशर: जब वी० सी० आपको रुकावट डाल रहा था तो और एम०पी० साहबान मीटिंग में मौजूद रहे होंगे ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद: जी, हां। उन्होंने कहा कि आप क्यों नहीं असरार साहब को बोलने देते। सही बात तो कह रहे हैं। मगर वी० सी० नहीं सुन रहा था।

श्री जैनुल बशर: वह एम० पी० आपका समर्थन कर रहे थे या नहीं ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद: वह सही समर्थन करेंगे।

श्री जैनुल बशर: जब आप वहां कह रहे थे तो वह आपकी ताईद कर रहे थे या नहीं ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद: वह यह भी कह रहे थे कि खामोश हो जाइए, नहीं तो यह इलैक्शन नहीं होने देंगे।

श्री जैनुल बशर: आप जिस फर्ज की अदायगी के लिये लोक-सभा से गये थे उसमें रुकावट डाली गई या नहीं ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद: वह चुनाव में बाधा डाल रहे थे।

श्री जैनुल बशर: आपका चुनाव तो होना नहीं था, आप तो यहां से चुनकर गये थे।

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद: हम लोगों को चुनना था।

श्री जैनुल बशर: वाइस चांसलर ने चुनाव न करा कर रुकावट डाली या मीटिंग में आपको बोलने के हक से महरूम कर के रुकावट डाली ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद: दोनों तरीके से उन्होंने कोशिश की । हमको बोलने नहीं देते थे और ना ही हमारे प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर पर डिसीज़न लेने देते थे । प्रैज़ीडेंट वहां रोक सकता है अगर कोई गड़बड़ी की बात करे। अगर कोई गड़बड़ी न करे तो उन्हें क्या अधिकार है ? उन्होंने खुद मान लिया है । अगर यह बात नहीं थी तो ऐसे ही उन्होने तारिक मोहम्मद के साथ मिसबिहेव किया । मेरे इंसीडेंट के बाद उन्होंने उसकी माफी भी मांग ली ।

श्री जयपाल सिंह कश्यप: वहां लाउड स्पीकर सिस्टम है ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद: जी हां, है ।

श्री चन्दूलाल चन्द्राकर: मैम्बर की हैसियत से जो हक हासिल है, उस हक को अदा करने में कौनसी ऐसी चीज थी जिस पर आपको शिकायत है ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद: मैं जो भी प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर रेज़ करता था, उस पर वह कहते थे बैठ जाइए।

मैंने यह कहा कि आप पहले तय कर चुके हो कि आज सिर्फ इलैक्शन होगा, फिर आज डिस्कशन क्यों हो रहा है ? इलैक्शन करो और झगड़ा खत्म करो ताकि कोर्ट कांस्टीट्यूट हो जाये और यूनिवर्सिटी का काम चल सके । वह तो उन्होंने होने नहीं दिया । हम कुछ कहते थे तो कहते थे कि बैठ जाइए और अपने समर्थकों को कहने देते थे । हमारे पास दो ही रास्ते थे या तो हम छोड़कर चले जायें या प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर रेज़ कर के कहें कि यह काम ठीक नहीं है ।

श्री चन्द्रलाल चन्द्राकर : ऐसा तो नहीं कि आप चुनाव की ही बात उठाते रहे हों और इसीलिये वह रोकना चाहते हों ? अकेले चुनाव में ही आपकी अधिक दिलचस्पी होने की वजह से तो आपको नहीं रोक रहे थे।

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : चुनाव के लिये ही तो सब को बुलाया गया था। आरिफ मोहम्मद खां ने भी यही कहा कि मैं पिछली मीटिंग में कोर्ट में नहीं था, आप यह बताइए कि पहले कोई रूलिंग आपने दे रखी है ? कहने लगे कि मैं दे चुका हूं, आपको नहीं मालूम है तो यह आपका कसूर है, आपका दिमाग खराब है ।

श्री चन्द्रलाल चन्द्राकर : आपने बताया कि आप 12 साल तक स्टूडेंट वहां पर रहे हैं, आपके रिश्तेदार वहां पढ़ते हैं, आप वहां की हरबात को बारीकी से जानते हैं, इसीलिये आपको बिना महसूस हुए, ऐसा तो नहीं था कि आप जरूरत से ज्यादा सवाल पूछते थे जो कि वह नहीं चाहते थे ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : जिसकी ज्यादा जानकारी होगी, वह ज्यादा सवाल करेगा । जिसको जानकारी कम होगी, वह कम सवाल करेगा । प्रोसीडिंग हमारे सामने थीं । मैंने कहा कि आपके दस्तखत से यह तय हो चुका है, फिर यह क्यों चल रहा है ? हमें तो हर चीज सामने रखनी थी।

श्री चन्द्रलाल चन्द्राकर : मैम्बर पार्लियामेंट, चाहे लोक-सभा के हों या राज्यसभा के, सब की एक राय थी या आपस में फर्क था ।

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : करीब-करीब एक ही बात थी । एक आध में डिफरेंस हो सकता है ।

MR. CHAIRMAN : As you know, discussions were relating to elections and electoral college. They took place for two days, you said. In your enthusiasm, you tried to persuade the whole body, including the Vice-Chancellor, of your views.

But the Vice-Chancellor thought :

"Well; we know enough of your views. Where is the necessity, again and again, for repeating the very same views ?"

SHRI MOHAMMAD ASRAR AHMAD : Sir, there was no question of 'views'.

वहां पर कुछ मैजोरिटी चाहती थी कि इलैक्शन आज हो जायें । जितने स्पीकर थे, सबने कहा कि आज इलैक्शन हो जायें, सिवाय उनके समर्थकों के जो इलैक्शन नहीं चाहते थे।

सभापति महोदय : सब लोगों का कहना था कि आज इलैक्शन थोड़ा डिस्कशन के बाद हो, तो उसमें आप थोड़ा जोर से बोलने लगे हों ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : और लोग भी जोर से बोलते थे लेकिन वह तो हम से ही कहते थे कि तुम चुप रहो क्योंकि मैं उनके बिल्कुल नजदीक था।

सभापति महोदय : आपका यह कहना है कि दूसरे के जोर से बोलने पर वह कुछ नहीं कहते थे।

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : हम ही से उनको ज्यादा तकलीफ थी । वह नाजायज काम करना चाहते थे, वह हमने होने नहीं दिया । हमने कहा कि ऐसा नहीं कर सकते । वह बात उन्हें बुरी लगी । वह हमारी बात सुनते ही नहीं थे।

श्री जैनुल बशर : वह मना करते थे कि आप मत कहिये ।

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : हमने कहा, लेकिन वह कहते थे कि आप बैठ जाइए ।

श्री जैनुल बशर : एलेक्शन का मामला एजेंडे पर था, आपने कभी एक बार भी उसके बारे में राय जाहिर की या नहीं।

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : आधी बात कही, फिर बन्द कर दिया । आगे बोलने नहीं दिया।

श्री जैनुल बशर : आप ने एलेक्शन के बारे में अपनी राय जाहिर की या उन्होंने आपको बिल्कुल बोलने ही नहीं दिया ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : आधी बात सुनी, आधी नहीं । हम ने कहा कि एलेक्शन होना चाहिए, उन्होंने कहा कि नहीं, नहीं, बैठ जाइए । तो फिर क्या करते ?

सभापति महोदय : आप का कहना है कि आप बोलना चाहते थे और वह बोलने नहीं देते थे ?

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : एक तो बोलने नहीं दिया और फिर हम ने पार्लियामेंट का नाम लिया तो कहा कि यह पार्लियामेंट नहीं है, यहां पर आप ऐज ए मैम्बर आफ पालियामेंट नहीं हैं । यह भी कहा कि हमारे ऊपर तुम्हारे हथौड़े पड़ चुके हैं । तो मैं हथौड़े डाल रहा था उन पर ? मैं यहां पर जोर से बोल रहा हूं तो क्या यहां आनरेबल मेम्बर्स पर हथौड़े पड़ रहे हैं ?

श्री ज़ैनुल बशर : वह इसलिये कह रहे थे कि आप बोल न सकें यही बात है

श्री मोहम्मद असरार अहमद : जी हां ।

सभापति महोदय : ठीक है । Thank you very much.

(*The Committee then adjourned*)

Thursday, 25 August, 1983

PRESENT

Shri R. R. Bhole—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri H. K. L. Bhagat
3. Shri Somnath Chatterjee
4. Shri George Fernandes
5. Shri Indrajit Gupta
6. Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal
7. Shri Y. S. Mahajan
8. Shri Ramayan Rai
9. Shri P. Shiv Shankar
10. Shri Zainul Basher

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. P. Gupta—*Chief Examiner of Bills and Resolutions*

WITNESS

Shri Saiyid Hamid,
Vice-Chancellor,
Aligarh Muslim University,
Aligarh.

(*The Committee met at* 15.30 *hours*)

Evidence of Shri Saiyid Hamid, Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Saiyid Hamid, you have been asked to appear before this Committee to give your evidence in connection with the question of privilege raised by Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., against you, for your alleged undignified and unbecoming behaviour with him at a meeting of the Court of Aligarh Muslim University held on 26 March, 1983.

I hope that you will state the factual position frankly and truthfully to enable this Committee to arrive at a correct finding.

I may inform you that under Rule 275 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, the evidence that you may give before the Committee is to be treated by you as confidential till the Report of the Committee and its proceedings are presented to Lok Sabha. Any premature disclosure or publication of the proceedings of the Committee would constitute a breach of privilege and contempt of the House. The evidence which you will give before the Committee may be reported to the House.

Now you may please take oath or affirmation as you like.

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : I swear in the name of God that the evidence that I give shall be true and I shall conceal nothing and that no part of the evidence shall be false.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Tell us whether you have been informed of what exactly is the complaint of Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad. What he says is that on 26th March 1983, there was some meeting of the court of Aligarh Muslim University in which Shri Ahmad also participated.

Of course, you presided over there as the Vice-Chancellor. In the course of that meeting, Shri Ahmad said that he sought the permission of the Chair (Vice-Chancellor) to express his views. However, as soon as he addressed the Chairman and he had not completed even the first sentence, the Vice-Chancellor interrupted him and, in an extremely harsh tone, asked him to lower his voice. He further said that whenever he spoke, his head was hammered. He might have pointed out to you that his hearing capabilities were not normal. Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad pointed out the hearing aid which he used and also explained that it was normal that such persons speak with raised voices and, even in Parliament, Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad spoke like that. On this, Vice-Chancellor told him contemptuously that this was not Parliament House, and you are not hard of hearing. You further said that you will interrupt him again and again. His further allegation is that this is not the first time that the Vice-Chancellor behaved in this manner. Even in an earlier meeting his behaviour with Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad was less than dignified. Because of the above-mentioned behaviour of the Vice-Chancellor he was finding it difficult to discharge his duties as representative of this hon. House on the court of Aligarh Muslim University. He felt that by acting in that unbecoming manner the Vice-Chancellor had committed breach of privilege and contempt of the House. These are the statements that he made before the House and also during the course of his evidence.

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : Sir, I had the opportunity of giving a written statement which was forwarded by the Ministry of Education. I submit at the outset that the allegations made against me are unfounded. I have the highest respect for Parliament and I have invariably behaved with decorum and respect towards all the members of the court including the members sent to the court of the university by Parliament. I have had a span of 37 years as a civil servant and, I believe, this hon. Committee would have the authority to get my entire record of service from the Deptt. of Personnel and I am sure they will not come across any incident in which I have behaved indecorously to a member of the Central legislature or the State legislature. I reiterate that the allegations are unfounded.

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : Surely, this incident is not born out of vacuum. Something must have happened which prompted him to say all this.

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : In case this hon. Committee is prepared to assign me time I would like to give the entire background of the functioning of the university with which this *episode* is related.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Try to be as brief as possible but you justify that incident in the background of what you think is relevant.

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : In fact, it was some time in the year 1980 that I was offered the Vice-Chancellorship of the Aligarh Muslim University.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKAR : Was there any reference to Parliament on that day?

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : I did not make any reference to Parliament. I did not utter the word 'Parliament' at all.

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT : The Member of Parliament says that he said that he has to speak loudly in Parliament also. Did he say that?

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : He did say that. He said on another occasion also, in the earlier meeting of the Court. I had taken him aside and spoke after that meeting was held. That was on the 20th December, 1982. And there too he was speaking very loudly. And when the meeting was over I took him aside; I pointed out to him and said, you may kindly speak less loudly because it affects the smooth functioning of the meeting. He had mentioned that he speaks loudly because he is hard of hearing. But there were occasions when he spoke in a normal tone as other members, when he was not excited. On those occasions he never spoke loudly. On the other occasion he did say, he is hard of hearing and so he speaks loudly.

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT : He told you, I am hard of hearing and I speak loudly in Parliament also. Well, to that, what did you say? How did you react to that?

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : I only wanted him, in the interest of the smooth functioning of the meeting, to speak less loudly; there was no reference made to Parliament by me.

श्री अंतुले बशर : क्या आपने उनको यह नहीं कहा कि "आपकी आवाज हथौड़े की तरह लगती है और "यह पार्लियामेंट नहीं है ?"

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : What I said was this : It is an idiom, it is a witticism; translated into English it might seem a little offensive; otherwise it is just a witticism, idiom-based. "आप जोर से बोलते हैं जो सामयिन के कानों पर हथौड़े बनकर गिरता है ।"

That witticism unfortunately, which should have made him less tense, was misconstrued. He appears to have felt hurt on that basis. It was an unfortunate thing that it was misconstrued. I had absolutely no intention of hurting him or saying that he was doing any damage to the ear-drum of the audience. That was never any intention.

AN HON. MEMBER : You said, you would interrupt him again and again.

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : No, Sir; this is a highly inconceivable thing. This can only be attributed to an urchin in a street brawl who would pull up his sleeves and say I will never allow you to speak. I never adopted a menacing or intimidating sort of attitude. It was a meeting for election of members because some 42 members from 6 constituencies had to be elected that day.

SHRI JAGANNATH KAUSHAL : In other times when he was not excited, he generally spoke in a normal way.

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : Yes. On this occasion he was speaking at a loud pitch. I had to conduct the meeting; I only wanted him to speak in a less loud tone. As Chairman I conduct the proceedings. If everybody speaks loudly, nobody can hear anybody.

SHRI JAGANNATH KAUSHAL : How long was he member of the Court?

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : The Court was recently constituted. It had two meetings, One was in December, 82. This was on March 26. In the second meeting this incident happened.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKAR : The Court was constituted after the other amending Bill was introduced.

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : For 15 years, virtually there was no court.

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : How long have you been the Vice-Chancellor?

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : For about three years. I took over the office of Vice-Chancellor in June 1980.

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : Was there any incident earlier where hot words or exchange of words had taken place between you and the M.P.?

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : No. I would not dub it as an exchange of hot words when I uttered a witticism which was unfortunately misconstrued. Perhaps, in all humility, I may say that I am a man with cool temperament. Never in my long career before taking over the office of Vice-Chancellor, has anybody accused me of being indecorous or rough or short-tempered.

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL : His complaint is the result of misconception on his part.

MR. CHAIRMAN : So, you say whatever allegations were made, as I read out to you, in the Lok Sabha were unfounded.

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : They are unfounded except the remarks made by me about the ears of the audience and those remarks were made as a witticism and that was not meant for hurting anybody.

सभापति महोदय : क्या आरिफ मोहम्मद खां आपके कोर्ट के मेंबर हैं ?

श्री सैय्यद हमीद : जी, हां ।

सभापति महोदय : क्या आपने उनसे माफी मांगी थी ?

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : It is absolutely wrong to say that I tendered an apology to Shri Arif Mohd. Khan. And I did not mention to anybody anything about the exchange of words that took place in the evening between me and Shri Arif Mohd. Khan, because, I thought, it was a matter relating to the Court. But the hon. Shri Arif Mohd. Khan gave a statement to a Urdu daily, Qaumi Awaz. Once that statement was out and that contained

a number of inaccuracies, to say the least, then the Public Relations Officer of the University issued a statement of facts. Both these papers can be summoned by this hon. Committee and they would give complete details of what had happened.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Will you send them immediately to us?

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : Certainly.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now that the matter has come on record, you have to have those things on record. Have you to ask any other question?

SHRI ZAINUL BASHER : I have already asked and he has not reacted so far.

सभापति महोदय : उन्होंने कहा है कि यह बात सही नहीं है ।

SHRI ZAINUL BASHER : He went on to Arif Mohammed Khan. I wanted to know the matter connected with Mr. Asrar Ahmed.

MR. CHAIRMAN : What exactly is your question?

श्री जैनुल बशर : उन्होंने अपनी साक्ष्य में बताया है कि दोनों तरीके से कोशिश की । न बोलने देते थे और न ही प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर उठाने देते थे । पिछली प्रोसीडिंग में देखिए—

श्री चन्द्रलाल चन्द्राकर : "मेंबर के हक हासिल करने के बारे में आपको क्या शिकायत है ?"

श्री असरार अहमद : "मैं जो भी प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर रेज करता था, उस पर वे कहते थे कि बैठ जाइए ।"

ये बातें कहां तक सच हैं ?

श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त : उन्होंने यह भी कहा है कि वाइस चांसलर ने चुनाव न कराकर रुकावट डाली ।

MR. CHAIRMAN : He says there is no such incident, but some incident did take place in the evening. Although it was a matter of Court, Arif Mohammed had issued some statement to which he replied.

SHRI ZAINUL BASHER : What had happened with Arif Mohammed that is not the subject. I am just asking what Asrar Ahmed is saying.

'वाइस चांसलर ने चुनाव न कराकर रुकावट डाली" "बोलने के हक से महरूम करके रुकावट डाली" इस तरह से दोनों तरह से रुकावट डाली ।

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : I have already replied to the last portion. To the earlier portion, I reply now. My submission is that I did not obstruct either the election or the right of the Hon. Member to speak in the Court of the University.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : The question is whether the charge of election being obstructed should be gone into by this Committee? It comes into the picture as a case of motivation. Otherwise, it has no relevance at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That is a proceeding of a court. In a court, the chairman is expected to regulate the proceedings according to rules, situation and the circumstances. The whole proceedings go on accordingly.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : If you can look into these things, you cannot restrict yourself to questioning the motive of one person.

श्री अंगुल बशर : आपने एजूकेशन मिनिस्ट्री को इंटीमेशन दी । उसके बाद आपने चिट्ठी भेजी है । इसके साथ एक्स वाइस चांसलर की भी चिट्ठियां हैं। एक मेंबर आफ पार्लियामेंट की भी चिट्ठी है जिसने आपके जवाब को ही कोलाबेट किया है । उस वक्त और भी पार्लियामेंट मेंबर कोर्ट की मीटिंग में रहे होंगे । क्या आपने उन लोगों से भी चिट्ठी लिखवाने की कोशिश की थी ? क्या उन लोगों ने भी कुछ लिखकर दिया है ?

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : Firstly, I did not make any effort to secure any letters from the members of the court. I did write to the two ex-Vice Chancellors who were present; and I wrote to a couple of Members of Parliament who were members of the court. But it is not as if I was trying to get chits from anybody to prove a case.

I will go a little into the background. I may have to mention that I have, by dint of hard work and resistance to all sorts of pressures, established stability and peace on the campus. It is a very delicate balance, and I did want that if there is nothing substantial in the remark alleging that I made a reference to Parliament, the facts should come to the notice of the hon. House or hon. Committee, because it was mentioned in the campus that there was a privilege motion against the Vice-Chancellor. There are certain elements who are not yet reconciled to the loss of their unmerited power and influence and who are not interested in stability on the campus. They started making a campaign that the Vice Chancellor should resign, because a privilege motion had been issued. So, it was in that context that I wanted

the hon. House to know the facts; and the obvious choice were the Vice Chancellors who had preceded me. There are three ex-Vice Chancellors who are members of the court. Two were present on that day. I also sent it to a couple of MPs. I may reiterate that slightest thing was likely to tilt the delicate balance which I have established on the campus.

SHRI ZAINUL BASHER : I understand there are about 7 or 8 MPs who are members of the court. You chose to write to only two of them. Why did you not write to others also?

SHRI SAIYID HAMID : I have already explained that it was not an omnibus correspondence which I had to make with all the members. I wrote letters to about 4 or 5 persons. Initially it was to the Vice-Chancellors and then a few MPs.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You may now withdraw.

(*The witness then withdrew.*)

APPENDICES

LIST OF APPENDICES

		PAGE
1.	Copy of notice of question of privileges dated 4 April, 1983, by Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P.	51
2.	Copy of factual comments furnished by the Ministry of Education and Culture (Department of Education)	54
3.	Copy of further letter dated 28 April, 1983, addressed to the Speaker, Lok Sabha, by Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P.	56

APPENDIX I

(*See* para 10 of the Report)

Copy of notice of question of privilege dated 4 April, 1983, by Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P.

MOHD. ASRAR AHMAD
MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT
(LOK SABHA)

4 April, 1983

The Speaker,

Lok Sabha.

Dear Sir,

I would like to give following notice under Rule 222 of the Procedure of the House :

1. That I was elected by the Lok Sabha as its representative to the Court of Aligarh Muslim University.

2. That a meeting of the Court was held on 26 March 1983 at Aligarh in which I also participated.

3. That in the course of meeting I sought permission of the Chair (Vice-Chancellor) to express my views. However, as soon as I addressed the Chairman and had not completed even the first sentence, the Vice-Chancellor interrupted me and in an extremely harsh tone asked me to lower my voice. He further said that whenever I speak he feels that his head is being hammered. I pointed out to him that my hearing capabilities are not normal. I pointed to the hearing aid I use, and also explained that it is normal that such persons speak with raised voices and even in Parliament I speak like this. On this the Vice-Chancellor told me contemptuously that this is not Parliament House and he is not hard at hearing. He further said that he will interrupt me again and again.

4. This is not first time that the Vice-Chancellor behaved in this manner. Even in an earlier meeting his behaviour with me and other members was less than dignified.

5. Because of the above mentioned behaviour of the Vice-Chancellor, I am finding it difficult to discharge my duties as a representative of this hon'ble House on the Court of Aligarh Muslim University.

6. I feel that by acting in this unbecoming manner the Vice-Chancellor has committed breach of privilege and contempt of the House.

I would like to bring this matter to your kind notice for taking necessary action.

With regards,

Yours sincerely,
Sd/-
(Mohd. Asrar Ahmad)

Encl : Verbatim Exchange.

श्री असरार अहमद — जनाब चेयरमैन साहब.....

सभापति — मेहरबानी करके आप इतने जोर से मत बोलिए। आप बोलते हैं तो लगता है कि सर पर हथौड़े चल रहे हैं।

श्री असरार अहमद — जनाब आप यह देख रहे हैं (कान के आले की ओर संकेत करके) मुझे कम सुनाई देता है और इसी वजह से शायद जोर से बोलता हूं। मैं पार्लियामेंट में भी जोर से बोलता हूं।

सभापति — यह पार्लियामेंट नहीं है। and unfortunately we are not hard of hearing.

श्री असरार अहमद — मुझ से पहले भी जोर से बोल रहे थे। आप मुझी को क्यों टोक रहे हैं?

सभापति — आप को बारबार टोका जायेगा।

Sd/-
(Mohammad Asrar Ahmad)

[*English translation of original in Hindi*]

SHRI ASRAR AHMAD : Mr. Chairman, Sir.....

CHAIRMAN : Kindly do not speak so loudly. When you speak one feels that the head is being hammered.

SHRI ASRAR AHMAD : Sir, you see this [indicating towards the hearing-aid] I am hard of hearing and that is why perhaps I speak loudly. I speak loudly even in Parliament.

CHAIRMAN : This is not Parliament and unfortunately we are not hard of hearing.

SHRI ASRAR AHMAD : Preceding Speakers were also speaking loudly. Why are you interrupting me only ?

CHAIRMAN : You will be interrupted again and again.

Sd/-

(Mohammad Asrar Ahmad)

APPENDIX II

(*See* para 11 of the Report)

Copy of factual comments furnished by the Ministry of Education and Culture (Department of Education).

CONFIDENTIAL

Parliament Paper

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION & CULTURE

(Department of Education)

SUBJECT : *Notice of question of privilege by Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P., against the Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University for allegedly using harsh language and interrupting him in the meeting of the University Court held on* 26-3-1983.

Lok Sabha Secretariat may kindly refer to their U.O. note No. 17/29/83/Priv/L–I, dated 20-4-1983 on the subject mentioned above. The Ministry had earlier sent an interim reply to the Lok Sabha Secretariat *vide* U.O. note of even number dated 14-4-1983 pending receipt of parawise factual comments from the Vice-Chancellor, AMU. This Ministry has now received the parawise comments on the points made in the notice of breach of privilege given by Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, MP, from the Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University which are reproduced below :—

"1.
2. } No comments.

3 to 6. It may be stated that Mr. Mohd. Asrar Ahmad participated at the meetings of the University Court held on Dec. 20, 1982 and March 26, 1983. Even at the first meeting Mr. Mohd. Asrar Ahmad spoke very loudly while speaking. This impeded the smooth functioning of the Court and adversely affected the deliberations and their even tenor. After this meeting was over I took Mr. Asrar Ahmad aside and requested him that it would be desirable if in future his intervention could be in a less loud tone. He stated that he speaks at the top of his voice because he is hard of hearing.

At the second meeting of the Court, Mr. Asrar Ahmad tried to monopolise the discussion and every few minutes he used to get up, gesticulate and talk at the top of his voice. Being charged with the responsibility of conducting the proceedings I had to request him to desist from frequent intervention and to speak less loudly. He stated that he spoke loudly because he was hard of hearing. This appeared to be incorrect because at other times when he was not excited he spoke in a lower tone. I requested him to speak less loudly for when he speaks at the top of his voice it falls like hammer on the ears of the audience.

It is entirely baseless to say that I made a reference to Parliament. This allegation has evidently been invented by Mr. Asrar Ahmad to support the privilege motion. There was no occasion for me to make a reference to Parliament and it would have been highly indecorous and in bad taste to make any such reference.

The University, it may be stated, has been following a serious schedule of teaching and research over the last twenty months. Standards have vastly improved all round. It has been my endeavour to maintain normalcy in the University and to uphold the traditions of the great institution of which I have the good fortune to be the Vice-Chancellor. I have the highest regard for Parliament and its Members and I have neither committed nor did I intend to commit a breach of privilege of any honourable M.P."

It is requested that the above facts may please be placed before the Speaker, Lok Sabha, for enabling him to decide the admissibility or otherwise of the notice of privilege in question.

This Ministry has no objection if the above facts are communicated to the Hon'ble Member concerned. This issues with the approval of the Deputy Minister for Education and Social Welfare.

Sd/-

(C. R. Pillai)

Deputy Secretary to the Government of India.

Lok Sabha Secretariat

(Shri M. P. Gupta, Chief Examiner of Bills and Resolutions)

Ministry of Education and Culture UO No. F. 16-64/83-Desk(U)

Dated April 21, 1983

APPENDIX III

(*See* para 13 of the Report)

Copy of further letter dated 28 April, 1983, addressed to the Speaker, Lok Sabha by Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad, M.P.

MOHD. ASRAR AHMAD

11, Windsor Place,
New Delhi
April 28, 1983

To

The Hon'ble Speaker,
Lok Sabha,
New Delhi.

Dear Sir,

Reference my notice of breach of privilege against the Vice-Chancellor of Aligarh Muslim University dated 4th April, 1983 and the comments of the Vice-Chancellor dated nil received by me through Lok Sabha Secretariat.

It is true that I attended both the meetings of the Court of Aligarh Muslim University on December 20, 1982 and March 26, 1983. But at no stage the Vice-Chancellor took me aside after the meeting to make any request.

I may be allowed to mention that I am possibly the oldest alumnus on the Court of AMU and very much emotionally involved with the welfare of the institution. As a conscientious member I have tried to contribute to the best of my abilities and shall keep doing so as long as I am associated with the University. If the Vice-Chancellor chooses to call it an effort on my part to monopolise the discussion he is free to do so. Indeed, at least in his letter he is using slightly mild language contrary to his extremely harsh outbursts in the meeting of the Court. Still I feel that even in his comments in response to the privilege notice the language and tone which he has used are not in the best traditions of Parliamentary procedure but smack of arrogance and scant respect for the Parliament.

He has tried to add insult to the injury by saying that in the meeting of the Court he made no reference to the Parliament and alleging that this has been invented by me. The Court has a strength of 100 members including 10 MPs, representatives of old students, ex-Vice-Chancellors, etc. I am surprised that instead of feeling sorry for all the derogatory statements which he made and withdrawing them in a gentlemanly manner he has chosen to own part of it and disown the rest.

The Vice-Chancellor in his comments has stated "that at the second meeting of the Court Mr. Asrar Ahmad tried to monopolise the discussion and every few minutes he used to get up, gesticulate and talk on the top of his voice". I deny this charge with all the force at my command. I started my parliamentary career in 1946, and find it extremely embarassing that the Vice-Chancellor has chosen to charge me with this kind of behaviour. However, if the Vice-Chancellor had this view about me he was well within his rights not to have allowed me to speak "on the ground that it impeded the smooth functioning of the Court and adversely affected the deliberations and their even tenor". But he did not do so. It appears that he chose the other way *i.e.* to interrupt me and insult me by saying that "my voice falls like a hammer on the ears of the audience".

I strongly feel that not only his conduct during the meeting of the Court but even his comments in response to the privilege notice amount to contempt and breach of privilege.

Sir, as the Presiding Officer of the Lok Sabha, it is your sacred duty to protect the dignity and honour of the House and its Members. I would request you to kindly refer this matter to the Privilege Committee to take whatever action it deems fit.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/-

(Mohd. Asrar Ahmad)
Member of Parliament.

MGIPRRND—S/3 LSS/83—TSS I—2-11-83—560.